

Remarks and Responses

Claims 6 and 14 have been allowed. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended, wherein claim 1 has incorporated the features of claim 6, and claim 8 has incorporated the features of claim 14. Claims 6 and 14 have been cancelled without prejudice. Therefore, claims 1-5, 7-13 and 15 remain pending in the present application.

Support for the amendments is found in the specification and claims as filed. Accordingly, the amendments do not constitute the addition of new matter. Reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and following comments is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103

With respect to paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Office Action, the Office Action rejected Claims 1-4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art in view of Kuwagaki et al. (US 4,310,220). Of the rejected claims, Claims 2-4, 5 and 7 depend from the amended Claim 1, and Claims 10, 12, 11, 13 and 15 depend from the amended Claim 8.

The Office Action stated that Claims 6 and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response thereto, the applicant has respectfully amended Claim 1 to include the allowable subject matter of Claim 6, and amended Claim 8 to include the allowable subject matter of Claim 14. Therefore, the amended

Claims 1 and 8 are now allowable. Since the amended Claims 1 and 8 are allowable, Claims 2-4, 5 and 7 depend from the amended Claim 1 are likewise believed to be allowable, and Claims 10, 12, 11, 13 and 15 depend from the amended Claim 8 are likewise believed to be allowable.

With respect to paragraph 6 of the Office Action, the Office Action rejected Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art in view of Kuwagaki et al. (US 4,310,220) further in view of Alwan (US 6,120,339). Of the rejected claim, Claim 9 depends from the amended Claim 8.

The Office Action stated that Claim 14 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


In response thereto, the applicant has respectfully amended Claim 8 to include the allowable subject matter of Claim 14. Therefore, the amended Claim 8 is now allowable. Since the amended Claim 8 is allowable, Claim 9 depends from the amended Claim 8 are likewise believed to be allowable.

Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that the claim rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusions

For all of the above reasons, applicants submit that the specification and claims are now in proper form, and that the claims define patentably over the prior art of record. Therefore applicants respectfully request issuance for this case at the Office Action's earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Stewart L. Gitler", written over a horizontal line.

Stewart L. Gitler

Reg. 31,256

Hoffman Wasson & Gitler

8-18-2005

2461 South Clark Street
Crystal Center 2 – Suite 522
Arlington, VA 22202
703.415.0100
Customer Number 20741